



DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

IN REPLY
REFER TO

J627

September 01, 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR JOINT SMALL ARMS/LIGHT WEAPONS COORDINATING
GROUP

SUBJECT: Joint Small Arms/Light Weapons Coordinating Group (JSA/LWCG) Meeting, July
12, 2011

The attached minutes of subject meeting are forwarded for information and action, as appropriate. Responses to open action items are due within thirty days from the publication of the minutes, unless stated otherwise in the action item.

The DLA Logistics Management Standards office point of contact is Mr. Lou Madrigal, JSA/LWCG Chair, 703-767-2011, DSN 427-2011 or email luis.madrigal@dla.mil.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Donald C. Pipp", is positioned above the printed name.

DONALD C. PIPP
Director,
Defense Logistics Management Standards

Attachment

cc:
ODASD(SCI)
Meeting Attendees



DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

IN REPLY
REFER TO

J627

September 1, 2011

MEMORANDUM FOR JOINT SMALL ARMS/LIGHT WEAPONS COORDINATING
GROUP

SUBJECT: Joint Small Arms/Light Weapons Coordinating Group (JSA/LWCG) Meeting, July
12, 2011

Purpose: The DLA Logistics Management Standards office convened a meeting of the JSA/LWCG on July 12, 2011, in McLean, Virginia. The agenda is enclosed. A list of attendees and materials presented are available on the JSA/LWCG webpage at <http://www2.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/programs/committees/JSALWCG/jsalwgc.asp>.

Brief Summary of Discussion: All topics of the enclosed agenda are briefly summarized below. Any new action items are shown at the end of each discussion topic and have been added to the action item track sheet available on the committee webpage. Mr. Lou Madrigal, JSA/LWCG Chair, facilitated the discussion.

1. Address Open Action Items. Mr. Madrigal stepped through the open action items.

a. The following action items originated from the June 3, 2009 meeting minutes.

- **FLIS UIT code assigned for SA/LW** – The Army still has to report the number of light weapons to be coded as SA/LW, and report whether or not the FLIS UIT code has been added for tracking. Marine Corps still had an action to report on whether the FLIS UIT code has been added. DLA Logistics Management Standards will provide Marine Corps with the POC at DLIS for NSN assignment and the proper UIT designator code (UITDC). Marine Corp will then contact DLIS to get the UITDC for small arms/light weapons applied to the NSNs. The Army Executive Agent or the Army JSA/LWCG representative will need to address this action item. Though both Army positions are being transitioned and the new individuals were not in attendance, representatives from Logistics Support Activity (LOGSA) noted that the Army is not updating the FLIS code as part of the cataloging process. Ms. Ellen Hilert commented that the FLIS code should be part of the normal process so that it makes it into the distributed CD-ROM catalogue. LOGSA indicated the FLIS code should be added by the item managers. The Chair reminded the Services that the current plan for implementing the IUID FLIS code will lead to sun-setting the UIT designator code in the future.

STATUS: Marine Corp: Awaiting confirmation that FLIS UITDC has been assigned to the NSNs they provided to DLIS. Army: New Army Executive Agent

and JSA/LWCG representative to get the Army numbers for SA/LW reporting and coding the FLIS UITDC to the weapons.

- **Component demil forecasts of light weapons** – DLA Disposition Services had requested components forecast the number of light weapons requiring demil. Forecasts were still pending for Army and Navy. Navy promised a response by the end of August. The new Army Executive Agent or JSA/LWCG representatives will need to address. DLA Disposal Services verified they do not need annual reporting, but wanted a one-time report to help with workload planning.

STATUS: DLA Disposal Services to verify if the information is still needed. Navy is planning to respond with their forecast numbers by the end of August.

- **Procedures compliance for processing burnt weapons** – Army was tasked to ensure that units are following proper procedure for burnt weapons. To that end LOGSA has coordinated with the DLA and the Marine Corps on recommended procedures for processing turned-in weapons that are difficult to identify as a weapon, even though that's what the turn-in document indicates.¹ Marine Corp volunteered to document the procedures and generate a Proposed DLMS Change (PDC).

STATUS: Will be completed by documenting the procedure. (See status for **PDC for burnt weapon policy changes** below).

- **Review coding of existing burnt weapons turned in to DDAA** – Army has been using the procedure developed as part of the proceeding action item to complete a tasking with DDAA to properly code burnt weapons turned in before the procedures were developed. DDAA reported there are still three burnt weapons at Anniston needing to be processed under the procedure.

STATUS: Army to work with DDAA to address the last few remaining weapons.

- **PDC for burnt weapon policy changes** – Marine Corps volunteered to take over the task of documenting the burnt weapons procedure into a PDC.

STATUS: By July 27th Marine Corps will provide the Chair with a new target delivery date after assessing the effort. *[Post Meeting: Action item lead reported that more input was going to be needed to evaluate the effort. Asked for extension to August 19, 2011 and extension was granted.]*

b. The following action items originated from the July 13, 2010 meeting minutes.

- **Common storage solution for moratorium small arms.** Navy asked that other components notify them as to any interest in developing a common solution for storing small arms affected by the ban on demil of select weapons. Action remains open for Army to respond if they are interested in exploring a common storage solution for small arms affected by the moratorium on demilitarization. Kathleen Row has retired, so the Army response should be noted back to the current Navy representatives.

STATUS: Army to respond to JSA/LWCG Chair and Navy Representatives.

¹ See JSA/LWCG Meeting Minutes, July 2010, §8.g.1, for a brief description of the process.

In related discussion Marine Corps reported they are seeking a means for relief from the moratorium through OSD, though Congressional action is the ultimate means for lifting the moratorium. DLA is not having an issue with the moratorium on the demil of marksman level weapons, but might be concerned if lifting the moratorium resulted in a surge of weapons being suddenly directed towards DLA Disposition Services for demil.

- **MIL-STD 129 Change 3 in open contracts.** Action remains open for Army to provide a list of open contracts being executed using requirements in MIL-STD 129 Change 3. DLA is in the process of changing to MIL-STD 129 Change 4.

STATUS: DLA Logistics Management Standards will contact new Army Executive Agent and JSA/LWCG representatives to pursue identifying any open contracts still requiring MIL-STD 129 Change 3.

- **SDRs for MIL-STD 129 Change 4 Non-compliance.** Even though the required means have been put in place for DDAA to submit SDRs for new procurement receipts which do not conform to the UII requirements of MIL-STD 129 (Change 4), a review of SDR reports indicates that there are no SDR using the related action code “3B” as would be expected by now.

STATUS: DLA HQ to verify DDAA is following the procedure.

- **Partial demil.** Tom Tkatch was the designated lead for documenting the issue of partial demil and offer some possible solutions. However, Mr. Tkatch has retired.

STATUS: On 8 Aug, a meeting with the new Army JSA/LWCG representative and the new Army executive agent was conducted in order to familiarize them with the JSA/LWCG and go over Army open action items.

- **Army Compliance with TRAC “S” DLMS procedure.** LOGSA reported they are working to get the requirement for generating out a Code “S” (“shipped”) transaction into the development queue.

STATUS: LOGSA tracking system change requirement.

Marine Corps asked if there is an interim solution for Army to notify the other DoD components when Army has made a shipment to them, and when Army receives a shipment from them. LOGSA representatives proposed sending the 80 column MILSTRAP DS_ transaction once a week through encrypted email with a digital signature. LOGSA will have more than one person able to prepare and email the data as a back-up. The extract will be based on identifying sending and receiving DoDAACs indicating an inter-Service transaction. Each Service is to inform LOGSA as where to send the extract. Services should validate that this interim process will be acceptable. LOGSA representatives noted that this interim solution will replicate the process before the DoD SASP registry redesign.

ACTION ITEM 1: LOGSA to establish interim solution for SA/LW Transaction Code “S” and “R” transactions based on 80 column MILS transactions, sent once a week through encrypted email with a digital signature to Service designated email addresses.

LOGSA representatives noted that some boxes are sent to locations with Standard Army Retail Supply System (SARSS) that do not open the box and do not report serial number data. This is an issue for reporting that needs to be elevated within the Army. LOGSA has talked to G4 and they refused to require a change since G4 sees the job at the SARSS location to get the boxes moved through quickly. The end point for receipt will use Property Book Unit Supply Enhanced (PBUSE) to record the receipt. WebUIT will get Army Serial Number Tracker (ARSNT) data to send the PBUSE data. The extract will come out of ARSNT. Thus there will not be a receipt until the delivery is received at the unit. Shipments are a problem as only some SSA sites will provide the information by serial number.

ACTION ITEM 2: Defense Logistics Management Standards to coordinate a white paper with LOGSA, Marine Corp and Navy explaining to G4 the need for a small arms receipt reporting procedure at SARSS locations.

2. **Address IUID Small Arms Action Items From SCI.** Prior to the JSA/LWCG meeting, the Chair distributed an email from Kathy Smith of the OSD (SCI) asking for assistance in closing out some actions from the IUID spring meetings that involved some JSA/LWCG members.
 - a. **LOGSA list of Duplicate UIIs to PM Soldier.** LOGSA sent records for duplicate UIIs (4k items with 8k UIIs) to Army and they subsequently were corrected. They still need to send duplicates to Air Force (~500 items with ~1k UIIs).

STATUS: LOGSA will contact Air Force and report on plans to address the remainder of items to the Chair.
 - b. **Procedures to Prevent Duplicate UIIs.** Marine Corps offered to send SCI their procedure for avoiding duplicate UIIs. Army remedied duplicate UIIs, all dupes were 2010 and earlier.

STATUS: Marine Corps will send SCI their UII avoidance procedure and Army will send message to G4 to notify SCI of their procedure.
 - c. **Provide Army IUID Marking Lessons Learned.** Email from Kathy Smith noted that Simit Bhandari followed up with Phil Gunning (Army Soldier Weapons PEO), and he asked for another 30 days.

STATUS: Phil Gunning will provide lessons learned to SCI.
 - d. **Report On Plans for DLMS Implementation.** The question of DLMS implementation plans should include discussion of the alternate standard logistics transactions approach vs. the SA/LW unique 140A and 888A transactions.

STATUS: Components to review and comment on As-Is transaction processes and comment back to the JSA/LWCG Chair regarding impact of switching to standards logistics transactions (Refer to section (4) below for related discussion).
 - e. **Future Plans.** This action from SCI relates to a discussion during the March 31st IUID meeting about using a single registry, for SA/LW reporting, which OSD supported. Would expect that should this become reality the Army would take the lead in providing the reengineering effort. There was a non-concur response from Marine Corps.

STATUS: Chair posted the IUID meeting minutes on the committee webpage. Component replies assessing the impact of utilizing a single SA/LW registry were due two weeks from the meeting date.

3. **IUID Registry Redesign.** Mr. Jim Craig briefed highlights of version 5 of the IUID registry.

The focus of the version 5 release is government furnished property (GFP). There have been several audits in the billions of dollars for GFP. As of July 11, 2011, WAWF will better support identification of GFP. An 856_PSN (Property Shipment Notice) will be sent to the IUID registry for non-UII items, when a contractor is involved. The system distinguishes between government and contractor based on the DoDAAC Service/Agency Code. WAWF also captures DUNS for agencies that use it. WAWF interacts with the IUID registry for all UII property, including small arms, for allowing for identification of existing marks and will edit to ensure UIIs are not duplicated (as new items). If a contractor attempts to send a reparable for a non-marked item, they will be rejected for not being registered. The item will have to go through registration marking prior to return. WAWF is not managing parent-child relationships beyond the first level of indenture. An XML schema is under development to build the parent-child relationship.

Through June, the IUID registry has not yet received a 527R, Materiel Receipt Acknowledgment (MRA) for registration from GFP, so Mr. Craig did not think the current requirement for inclusion of the GFP contract number has been implemented. Lockheed Martin had stepped up to support the 527R, MRA, but in the requirement for inclusion of the contract number (which is needed for the registry process) was established after requirements definition. It was noted that Lockheed Martin is sending the 527R, MRA, to DLA. Ms Hilert asked if it would be feasible for DLA to request the enhanced MRA content to support this process.

The IUID registry team is working with property systems to batch load items distributed to contractors, and with contractors to get their systems to load by contract number.

DFARS is being rewritten and being tied to developing DoDI 4161.2, "Management, Control and Disposal of Government Property in the Possession of Contractors." This will clarify that reparables sent for work by contractors are GFP. Clause includes use of WAWF or DLMS transactions to meet the requirement. Expected to be finished later this year or early 2012.

The IUID registry is in Battle Creek. It will be moving to the DISA Defense Enterprise Computing Center in Ogden in 2012, and become part of J62 infrastructure moving from BTA.

Requirements planned for the future v5.1 of the IUID registry include:

- There is a proposal to merge UII and non-UII into one XML schema. There will be only one DoDAAC per contract owner, and one CAGE per contract DoDAAC. When subcontractors are involved, the prime is the accountable owner. An issue to be resolved is figuring out how to take the From/To in a transaction and use it to tie-

back to a contract number for identifying the prime contractor. The DoDAAD Chair indicated that CAGE-DODAAC approach needs to be proposed to the DoDAAD.

- Supply condition code is optional for sending into the registry (XML schema, 527R), to address the CAV functionality, and the format breaks out the contract number separate from delivery order field. The MILSTRIP Administrator expressed concern about supporting CAV functionality without recognizing the underlying logistics requirements as defined in MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP. Mr. Craig responded that the intent is to harmonize WAWF with logistics.

ACTION ITEM 3: Mr. Craig to verify that incorporation of CAV code functionality will conform to MILSTRIP/MILSTRAP requirements.

- The information captured does not include contract life, as that requirement was not requested. The query capability will be available for contract administrators to search in advance of the end of a contract to perform their responsibilities.

4. **140A & 888A vs. Standard Logistics Transactions.** The Chair provided some brief background regarding this topic which has been discussed at the prior two JSA/LWCG meetings and the March 2011 IUID-Small Arms meeting.

In evaluating a switch to the standard logistics transactions, each Component needs to consider where they are in migrating from MILS to DLMS. A staggered transition would be tracking in which trading partners are using 140A versus the standard transactions. Understand that the proposed mapping distributed in the presentation at the IUID-Small Arms meeting is a best guess, but would need to verify particular requirements to map for each Service's requirements. Last year, JSA/LWCG discussed that some components might not be duplicating the standard transactions with their small arms reporting. However, Ms. Mary Jane Johnson clarified that some are duplicating MILS transactions, such as TRAC R and without the serial number.

IUID will mandate standard logistics transactions incorporate UIIs, which would be in addition/redundant to the 140A. A way forward would be to include the Small Arms reporting transaction codes and have DLA Transaction Services split off the small arms transaction for Services not migrated to DLMS. Also, with ERPs evolving, there might be an opportunity to get standard transactions into the requirements on the earlier side.

The Chair wants to get JSA/LWCG member thoughts about the impact of using the standard logistics transactions (with minor enhancements) instead of the 140A. There was an As-Is vs To-Be draft mapping diagramed in the last IUID-Small Arms meeting. There should be one DoD-wide DLMS transition approach (with phased implementation supported by DLA Transaction Services). The sooner a decision can be reached the better for development, as there will be a lot of work to draft the changes for the standard logistics transaction approach.

ACTION ITEM 4: Chair will redistribute As-Is SA/LW transaction flow diagrams to get feedback on accuracy from component perspectives. Components should note any

current DLMS migration plans. *[Post Meeting: Closed: Chair sent out As-Is brief on 18 Jul 2011.]*

ACTION ITEM 5: Components to provide feedback on concept of moving to standard logistics transactions for DLMS implementations.

Services asked if the approach would relate to intra-Service transactions. The idea is focused around what is now a MILS DIC AS, D4, D6. Services may not use MILS to communicate all intra-service receipts. Further research will be needed to determine the best method to accommodate small arms transaction codes that do not have an equivalent in standard logistics transactions.

Marine Corps is looking for advice on how Crane will become DLMS compliant. The short answer is a system is DLMS compliant when using the DLMS transactions and business rules. LOGSA representatives were asked how they and GCSS-Army envision DLMS compliance. LOGSA reported that GCSS-Army is performing a short term solution to transact with the DoD SA/LW registry in the MILS format, since the registry has not yet upgraded to DLMS transactions. The long-term plan is for GCSS-Army to have a direct connection to the DoD SA/LW registry to see the full reporting history. Communications in/out of Army will be communicated through GCSS-Army. Army is programming for duplicate work due to the nature of the current environment.

The Chair recognized that JSA/LWCG might need at least monthly meetings if the direction is to change to standard logistics transactions.

5. **Supply Discrepancy Report (SDR) Component Info.** Ms. Ellen Hilert, DoD SDR System Administrator, provided a presentation on Supply Discrepancy Reports (SDR) procedures.

The SDR is a tool used to report shipping or packaging discrepancies attributable to the responsibility of the shipper, (including Government sources, contractors/ manufacturers or vendors) and to provide appropriate responses and resolution. In order to use SDRs for trend analysis and metrics DoD users must ensure use of the proper discrepancy code to identify the problem. WebSDR allows up to three discrepancy codes per SDR and includes unique values assigned to support IUID.

The SDR subcommittee page has many useful links such as code sets and manual procedures updates waiting to be published. (<https://www2.dla.mil/j-6/dlms/Programs/Committees/Supply/supplySDR.asp>)

SDR procedures includes Arms, Arms parts, Ammunition, and Explosives in a group requiring expedited action to report within 24 hours of discovery, and response within 25 days. Looking for feedback on better ways to scope this rule (i.e. should arms parts be removed?). LOGSA noted that an old suspicion of small arms parts making it to civilian hands might have resulted in small arms parts being added to this category since they were not being tracked before.

SDR procedures originally applied to wrong item received discrepancies, not wrong serial number. However, procedures have been expanded to include IUID mismatches applicable to serial number and UIIs.

A participant asked if small arms ever come out classified as secret? Response is they are sensitive, but not secret.

It is not clear yet what level of management intensity will be applied to small arms under IUID. The Army has asked OSD to reconsider using two levels of intensity (high and standard) and treat all serially managed items as high. This would apply the expedited reporting and response procedures to many more SDRs. Possibly have to maintain business rules based upon the Controlled Inventory Item Code (CIIC) if all serially managed items become intensively managed items. Some recent discussion at OSD/SCI of only having one level of intensity would place SA/LW in the high category.

Ms. Hilert noted that OSD has indicated Components are to examine concept for stand-alone SDR applications and work toward SDR integration into their modernized supply systems. SDR integration into modernized supply systems allows for SDR generation as a byproduct of receiving and systemic capture of the UII/serial number on the SDR. Navy mentioned they have kept SDR processing separate rather than integrate with the Navy Enterprise Resource System (ERP) as originally planned. DLA Disposition Services will benefit from DLA's Distribution Standard System (DSS) which will be integrating SDRs.

SDR codes specific to UIT are not being used anymore. Have some similar codes, but want to know if there are any gaps needed to be filled. Ms. Renea Burns will ask about the use of these or replacement codes.

Ms. Hilert presented an example of the use of SDR Code "U8" and asked for help in determining if the correct process was followed. It was agreed that the SDR, which was rejected, should have been accepted for information/metrics, but that correct disposition instructions were provided. LOGSA guesses that the UII got chopped into a serial number field and the intended weapon was shipped, but Ft. Dix had to accept a weapon with a bogus serial number. In a similar situation LOGSA advised steps to correct the shipment information. LOGSA advises there be an enforcement mechanism to ensure SDRs are looked at and addressed.

Ms. Hilert showed a management report for SDRs available from WebSDR ad hoc query. The report is being fine tuned to help those without an automated system prioritize SDRs. JSA/LWCG members could get a SAR request to access the query, but DLA Logistics Management Standards plans to run the query regularly for posting to the JSA/LWCG member page. LOGSA was asked to look into what FSCs might be a means to identify small arms (i.e. FSCs 1055, 1095).

ACTION ITEM 6: LOGSA will send the list of FSCs exclusive to small arms and small arms parts to DLA Logistics Management Standards. DLA Logistics Management Standards will establish criteria for a recurring report for visibility of small arms related SDRs (allow 6 months for requirements and programming).

6. Implementation of ADC 399.

The Issue Release/Receipt Document (DD Form 1348-1A or DD Form 1348-2) Continuation Page is being added to address multiple UII entries on a 1348-1A/1348-2. DSS has an SCR to move forward with the ADC requirements. Evaluating if there are issues with the timing for printing the continuation page and dual sided 1348s. There is a concern about multiple continuation pages for large MRO issues.

The details for the technical approach are relatively thick, but available in the ADC for those that are interested.

JSA/LWCG reps asked about the 'cramming' of serial barcodes onto the 1348-1A. Ms. Hilert noted the mock-up in the ADC is not an exact implementation layout. Real look will probably be columns as opposed to the staggered representation in the mock-up. Ms. Hilert mentioned that the implementation wants to be accommodating to small arms, and asked for any input to be provided.

***ACTION ITEM 7:** Ms. Renea Burns to verify if DSS 12.2 will be implemented with requirements for ADC 399. [Post Meeting: Ms. Burns reported the following as part of an SPRC meeting on 8/8/2011: "ADC 399 is to be included in DSS 12.2 the cutoff date is scheduled in Nov 2011, a Proposed Change Request needs to be submitted to J6."]*

7. **Burnt Weapons.** Anniston is conducting a wall-to-wall and following DoD 4160.28 for DEMIL. They have outlined unserviceable condition small arms. Weapons in condition code E and H require disposition instructions from Services. They are working with Services to figure out how they want to work these codes. Ms. Hilert noted that many of the condition discrepancy items may have SDRs associated with them and the Services need to provide disposition instructions to close out the SDRs.

8. **Reutilization Business Integration Update.** DLA Disposition Services presented an overview of RBI. They are in the process of replacing their current system by integrating requirements into EBS and DSS. Have the ETID to facilitate electronic turn-ins by those without an automated system. DLA Disposition Services is taking advantage of the RBI program to re-engineer for containerization of items for sale, bar-coding/RFID/UII, and online NSN searches. Among the particulars for small arms, the RBI program highlighted:

- Accountability requirements will be satisfied in DSS
- Current interfaces have been identified and will be redirected to DSS
- Disposal Services Field Office Anniston will be the only site to process Small Arms
- Disposition Services will continue to maintain the DLA Small Arms Registry

9. **LOGSA Investigative Inquiries.** LOGSA presented data for SASP inquiries. The trends show that SASP requests have been stable for the past four years. The ATF, FBI, and the police made over two thousand inquiries in 2010. Overall, forty percent resulted in a serial number match. However, LOGSA noted that a matched serial number does not guarantee that it is the weapon being sought.

PREPARED BY:



Luis Madrigal
JSA/LWCG Chair

APPROVED:



Donald C. Pipp
Director,
Defense Logistics Management Standards